



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,049 10		10/11/2000	Venkata R. Jagana	BEA9-2000-0005-US1	4959
25253	7590	06/13/2005		EXAMINER	
IBM COR			VAUGHN JR, WILLIAM C		
IP LAW DEPT, ED02-905 15450 SW KOLL PARKWAY				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BEAVERTON, OR 97006-6063				2143	
				DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/686,049	JAGANA, VENKATA R.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	William C. Vaughn, Jr.	2143					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2005.							
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☒ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	<u>:</u>						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
6. Patent and Trademark Office							

WG

M

Application/Control Number: 09/686,049 Page 2

Art Unit: 2143

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Action is in regards to the Amendment and Reply received on 01 March 2005.

#### Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 19-30 are is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 7, lines 10-19, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments and intangible embodiments. As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the

subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding exemplary independent claim 1, the recitation means for communicating directly between the first and second hosts" is unclear as to what qualifies as directly communicating. It is the examiner's position that directly communicating between the first host and second host could mean communicating with another host through which another device is between the two hosts. It is requested that the Applicant clarify whether or not there is intervention between the two hosts.

Page 3

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson, U.S. Patent No. 6,718,347 in view of Latif et al. (Latif), U.S. Patent No. 6,400,730.
- 8. Regarding claim 1, Wilson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Wilson discloses a system for communication between a first host and second host comprising: means for communicating between a first host and a storage area network using a area network protocol [see Wilson, Figures 12, 13, 16, Col. 34, lines 49-67, Col. 35, lines 1-12]; means for communicating between a second host and the storage area network using the area network protocol [see Wilson, Col. 11, lines 15-47]; and means for communicating directly between the first and second hosts using the protocol using the area network protocol [see Wilson, Col. 11, lines 15-47, Col. 14, lines 12-39]. However, Wilson does not explicitly disclose means for

Art Unit: 2143

communicating directly between the first and second hosts using the storage area network protocol in a non-ESCON protocol manner.

- 9. In the same field of endeavor, Latif discloses (e.g., methods and apparatus for receiving, translating and routing data packets between different protocols). Latif discloses storage area network protocol in a non-ESCON manner [see Latif, Col. 1, lines 35-44, Col. 2, lines 15-67, Col. 6, lines 6-67].
- 10. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Wilson's teachings of a method for use in a computer system including first and second computers and first and second storage systems with the teachings of Latif, for the purpose of providing a more efficient means for communication between different protocols [see Latif, Col. 1, lines 65-67 and Col. 2, lines 1-54]. Thus, Wilson provides motivation to combine by stating that there exists a need improve performance modifying existing ESCON protocol [see Wilson, Col. 14, lines 28-30]. Furthermore, Wilson also discloses that other standard conventional communication links between the storage controllers could be used [see Wilson, Col. 10, lines 28-52]. By this rationale claim 1 is rejected.
- Regarding **claim 2**, Wilson-Latif further discloses wherein the storage area network protocol is a FICON protocol (Latif teaches utilizing FCP (Fiber Channel Protocol), [see Latif, Col. 2, lines 15-34]. The same motivation that was utilized in claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2. By this rationale **claim 2** is rejected.
- 12. Regarding claims 3, Wilson-Latif further discloses wherein the means for communicating comprises: means at the first host for translating between the storage area network protocol and

Application/Control Number: 09/686,049

Art Unit: 2143

a host- to-host communications protocol selected from the group consisting of TCP/IP [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37] and SNA (The Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03), that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made for the communication protocol selection to have included SNA since SNA can be and is used with TCP/IP as well as being utilized at the data link layer and thus since Wilson does provide for the teachings of the data link layer that defines the physical format in which data is to be transferred to and/or from the network), [see Wilson, Col. 32, lines 49-54]. By this rationale claim 3 is rejected.

- 13. Regarding claims 4-6, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as that of claims 1-3 and thus are rejected for the same rationale in rejection of claims 1-3.
- 14. Claims 7-18, list all the same elements of claims 1-6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection of claims 1-6 applies equally as well to claim 7-18. Furthermore with regards to the limitations of encapsulating TCP/IP packets from the first host in 8232 protocol frames (Latif teaches encapsulation that is over a high speed network), [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37]; transmitting the 8232 protocol frames to the second host using the FICON protocol [see Latif, Col. 6, lines 23-37]; and decapsulating the TCP/IP packets from the 8232 protocol frames at the second host [see Latif, Col. 11, lines 57-63].
- 15. Regarding **claims 19-30**, list all the same elements of claims 1-6, but in article for communicating form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection of claims 1-6 applies equally as well to claim 19-30.

Art Unit: 2143

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Vaughn, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3922. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-6:00, 1st and 2nd Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William C. Vaugha, Jr.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2143 08 June 2005

**WCV**